

- 8 -

Benjamin N. ELDRIDGE *et al.*  
Appl. No. 09/364,788***Remarks***

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicants cancelled claims 76-79 without prejudice or disclaimer and amended claims 58 and 67. Unless otherwise indicated, the claim amendments are for purposes of clarity and not to overcome any other rejection in the Official Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments place the application in condition for allowance and do not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. Thus entry of this Amendment is in order. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 58 - 75 will be pending.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 76-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not supported in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse; however, to expedite prosecution, claims 76-79 were cancelled.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 58-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants prior art in figures 1A-1B and Grabbe et al. (US 5,152,695). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 58 and 67 recite, *inter alia*, an electronic component comprising a substrate including a conductive area and a connecting layer coupling the conductive area to internal circuitry within the electronic component.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Applicants' prior art and Grabbe et al. fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. In particular, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest **a connecting layer coupling the conductive area to internal circuitry within the electronic component**, as recited in claims 58 and 67.

For example, Applicant's prior art, as illustrated in Fig. 1B, includes an integrated circuit 120 and a contact pad 122 within the integrated circuit 120. Fig. 1B, however, fails to teach or suggest anything about a connecting layer coupling the contact pad 122 to internal circuitry within the integrated circuit 120, as achieved in the instant invention. Both Applicants' Fig. 1A and Grabbe et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies of Applicants' Fig. 1B as applied to the present invention. In particular, Fig. 1A and Grabbe et al. fail to teach or suggest a connecting layer, as recited in claims 58 and 67.

By contrast, the instant invention provides, as shown, for example, in Applicants' Figs. 2B and 6J, respective wiring layers 206 and 603. The wiring layers 206 and 603 couple respective contact pads 207 and 604 to internal circuitry within the integrated circuit substrates. Please see, for example, Applicants' specification page 12, lines 20-22.

Therefore, assuming *arguendo*, that one would be motivated to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Office Action, the present invention would not be obvious in view of such a combination. The suggested combinations would not result in the presently claimed invention wherein **a connecting layer coupling the conductive area to internal circuitry within the electronic component**.

In view of the above arguments, it is clear that the present invention would not have been rendered obvious by the suggested combination to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Therefore, claims 58 and 67 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being patentable, either alone or in combination, over Applicants' prior art and Grabbe et al.

Claims 59-66 depend from claim 58, and claims 68-75 depend from claim 67. Therefore, claims 59-66 and 68-75 are allowable at least for the reasons claims 58 and 67 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

- 10 -

Benjamin N. ELDRIDGE *et al.*  
Appl. No. 09/364,788**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN &amp; FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 52,374

Date: June 6, 2003

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 06 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

::ODMA\MHODMA\SKGF\_DC1;137005;1